

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-7 are currently pending. Claims 1-7 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,062,579 to Tateyama et al. (herein after merely “Tateyama”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,088 to Chiba et al. (hereinafter, merely “Chiba”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,172,765 to Kawamoto..

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“...the profile information is divided into the minimum setting information, digital still camera (DSC) setting information, digital television (DTV) setting information, DSC and DTV setting information.”

Claim 1 recites the element “profile information,” which is characterized as, “divided into the minimum setting information, digital still camera (DSC) setting information, digital television (DTV) setting information, DSC and DTV setting information.”

That is, the profile information denotes the type of the picture data that can be coped with by the printing device. The profile information is divided into the minimum setting information (minimum), DSC setting information, DTV (digital television) setting information, DSC and DTV setting information.

The profile information is shown in FIG. 10 and input as a response packet to the data conversion unit. Referring to FIG. 10, if [00] in hex is stated in the operand, the data conversion unit recognizes that the printing device is at the minimum setting. If [01], [02] and [03] are stated in the operand, the data conversion unit recognizes that the printing device is at the DSC setting, at the DTV setting and at the DSC and DTV setting, respectively.

The data conversion unit has a table shown in FIG. 11 and, responsive to the setting of the printing device, recognizes the profile coped with by the printing device. The data conversion unit is responsive to the contents stated in the operand to recognize the image size and the image type supported by the printing device. For example, if the data conversion unit recognizes that the printing device is at the minimum setting, from the statement of [00] in the operand of the response packet from the printing device, the data input unit recognizes that only the 640 pixel by 480 pixel picture data of the sRGB form is coped with by the printing device. Publ App. pars. [0098]-[0100].

The Office Action, at page 3, points to Chiba, col. 41, lines 39-41, for describing the profile information of the present application. The Office Action states, “Note: printer resolution

is interpreted as being equivalent to a profile as defined in applicant's specification." While not conceding the stated equivalence, the profile information, as distinguished from the profile, is part of the operand of a data packet.

The profile information includes characteristic settings of the printer indicative of the type of picture data with which the printing device can cope. In particular, the type of picture data includes the image size and the image type supported by the printing device. The input/output transmits to said data source side the profile information. This is distinguishable from the printer resolution of Chiba, a characteristic of the printer that is not a part of a packet operand.

There is no suggestion in Chiba of profile information, as recited in claim 1.

Tateyama and Kawamoto do not add the elements missing from Chiba as discussed above.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 2-7 are also believed to be patentable.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800